

**Access Control Points and Security Fencing
Fort Riley, KS
DACA41-03-B-0001**

**Questions and Answers
Set 2, 3 Feb 03**

Questions 1-39 are in Questions and Answers Set 1.

Access Control Points questions start on page 5.
Cantonment Fencing questions start on page 14.

General Questions (applicable to both projects):

40. The bid documents state that the contractor is responsible for developing the temporary erosion control measures for both projects. However, by not defining the minimum standards that will apply to these two projects, there is likely to be difference of opinion as to what minimum measures the contractor is expected to provide. Considering the potential exposure to large unforeseen costs related to temporary erosion control measures we request that the bid documents be amended to provide the minimum standards of temporary erosion control measures that the contractor will be expected to implement for these two projects.

The contractor shall follow Best Management Practices (BMP's) and the stormwater prevention plan (SWP2) shall be in conformance with the Kansas Department of Health and Environment's (KDHE's) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Discharge Permit requirements referenced in the specifications Section 01355A-5, Environmental Protection.

41. Sheet #G2 for the Cantonment Security Fence Project and Sheet #G4 for the Access Control Points Project provide a Rock Depth Chart that indicates the approximate depths to Rock based on five different Soils Classifications. However, when we reviewed the plans for both projects on a few drawings for the Security Fence Project provided Soils Classifications that could be correlated to the Rock Depth Chart. Without the Soils Classification information the bidders cannot use the Rock Depth Chart to ascertain the depths to rock. Since this information is crucial to the development of site-specific excavating and trenching costs, we request that this missing information be provided as quickly as possible to all of the bidders.

The "Rock Depth Chart" information for the depth to rock is based on USDA, SCS "Soil Survey of Riley & Geary Counties". The information provided is the best information available; any additional information is the Contractor's responsibility. The Rock Depth Chart was deleted from the ACP project plans; soil borings are included in that project.

42. For these two projects, is it expected for the earthwork to generate a surplus, a deficit, or will it be an earthwork balance?

This is the contractor's responsibility to determine.

43. If the contractor runs out of suitable excavated soils for the construction of new embankments is there an on-site source of embankment material that is available at no cost to the contractor?

See section 02300 in amendment 5. The borrow site is shown on G1.

44. Are the on-site soils considered suitable to reuse as fill material?

See section 02300 in amendment 5.

45. Presently, both sets of drawings use one line weight for both existing contours and proposed contours, which makes it very difficult for bidders to visualize and estimate the earthwork, and this may lead to confusion regarding the earthwork scope of work. Typically, a lighter line weight is used for existing contours and a heavier line weight is used to differentiate the proposed contours. In order to assist the bidders in preparing accurate earthwork take-offs we request that the grading plans be reissued with different line weights for these two contour lines. This revision will also be very helpful for the field personnel when the projects are being constructed.

This is addressed by amendment 6.

46. The site plans for both projects do not indicate the character of the existing pavement materials that will be encountered when excavating and trenching for the proposed security improvements. For instance, when new ductbanks or pipelines cross existing paved areas the drawings do not indicate the thickness of the existing roads or the type of pavement in those areas (portland cement concrete pavement versus bituminous concrete pavement). The same lack of information occurs when existing pavement in roads and in shoulders is to be excavated. Without this important information the bidders cannot determine the site-specific costs for performing the trenching and excavation work as well as the trench restoration work, which normally matches the existing pavement. Please provide this missing information.

There are to be no pavement cuts for installation of utilities. All areas not disturbed by other construction will be installed by boring as indicated by amendment 6. Specification requirements are addressed by amendment 5.

47. Sheet #E23 for the Security Fencing Project and Sheet #E35 of the Access Control Points Project show typical trench details for concrete encased ductbanks. These Details specify various backfill materials, such as Sand or Granular Backfill for the first 2'-0" above the concrete encasement, and Selected Material for the top 12" of the trench. With regard to these backfilling requirements, please clarify the following: (a) will the excavated soils from those trenches meet the backfilling requirements without screening or other soil processing methods; (b) is imported backfill material required; (c) since the ductbanks are encased in concrete, why can't the contractor reuse the excavated materials (as-is) for the entire 3'-0" of backfill?

Ductbanks are to be installed per details and specifications. Excavated material could only be used if it meets the specification requirements; it is unknown if it does.

48. Clause #52.236-1 on page #71 of 77 of the Solicitation states that the contractor is to self-perform a minimum of 50% of the work. However, in Paragraph #1.2 on page #01100-1, there are provisions for contractors to subcontract more than 70% of the work. Considering the aggressive schedule, the diversity of the work, and the specialty work required by both the Security Fencing Project and the Access Control Points Project, it is anticipated that most, if not all, bidders will need to subcontract more than 50% of the work. Therefore, we wish to confirm that the Contractor will be allowed to subcontract more than 50% of the work as long as the

contractor complies with the requirements stipulated in Paragraph #1.2 on page #01100-1. Please clarify.

The percentage was changed to 20% in amendment 5.

49. It is our interpretation of the bidding documents that there is only one performance period (365 calendar days) for all of the various contracting scenarios, whether or not the contract is only for the Security Fencing work, just the Access Control Points work, or for both of these contracts, or only for the Base Bid work, or for the Base Bid work plus any of the various combinations of the Add-on Optional Items. Furthermore, this performance period is intended to cover 100% Completion, and not just the Substantial Completion of the work. Based on the size and complexity of these projects, and the fact that the performance period commences with Notice-to-Proceed, the specified performance period is not sufficient to cover 100% of the work (all base bid work plus all add-on optional items). Therefore, we request that a reasonable amount of additional time be added to the Base Bid Performance Period for each of the Add-on Optional Items.

Your interpretation is correct. Much of the work can be done concurrently and Riley needs to have the permanent access control gates and fence in place as soon as possible. No additional time will be added if the options are exercised.

50. With regard to the Termiticide Treatment included in Section #02364 of the Technical Specifications, please clarify where this treatment is intended to be applied, since none of the buildings are wood-framed and none of the Architectural drawings specify this treatment.

This specification will be deleted.

51. Is there going to be any access control readers in this project?

No.

52. During the Site Visit on 12-19-02 the attendees noticed that the drawings in possession of the ACOE representative were much clearer to read because the line weight representing the new work was much bolder and darker than the line weight representing the existing conditions. The bidders questioned why their drawings were not as easy to read. No definite cause was determined. However, there was overall agreement that the different line weights were somehow not transferred to the bidders' CD's. This is probably the reason why the new topographic lines are the same line weight as the existing topographic lines (see Citadel RFC-02, dated 12-12-02, item #31). Therefore, when the revised drawings are issued in CD format, we trust that the line weight problem can be resolved so that the new CD's allow the bidders to print out drawings that represent all new work in darker, bolder line weight.

This will be addressed by amendment 6.

53. When the new CD's are issued for the revised drawings, we request that all changes to the drawings be "clouded" and marked with triangular Revision Symbols and Numbers so that the bidders can quickly locate the changed information and incorporate the new information into their estimates.

The revised items on amendment 6 are indicated with the use of a numbered triangle.

54. Since both projects are to be bid as Fixed Price Lump Sum contracts, please clarify the intention of the Classified Excavation specifications in Paragraph #1.5 on page #02300a-3 of the Earthwork Section. Since the language in Paragraph #1.5.1 may be interpreted as providing additional compensation for encountering Rock Excavation, we wish to know if the bidders are to include any costs for Rock Excavation in their bids for both projects. Please clarify.

See sections 02300, 02315 and 02316 in amendment 5 which covers most of this information. All excavation is unclassified.

55. There is a substantial amount of new Fiber Optic Cable that is to be pulled through existing duct banks on both projects. However, there is no information provided on the age, size, type and condition of the existing duct banks. Please provide this missing information, and clarify whether or not the bidders are to assume that these duct banks are free and clear to accommodate the new Fiber Optic Cable.

A note has been added by amendment 6 to Sheet E35 of the ACP project and Sheet E23 of the Security Fencing project to indicate that the contractor is to assume that the existing ducts are free and clear and properly sized to accommodate new cables.

56. Will contractors be allowed to enter the Base from any available gate? Please comment.

Please refer to Specification Section 01100, paragraph 1.4, Fort Riley Access Control.

57. Where will our lay down area be located?

Please refer to Spec Section 01500A, Temporary Construction Facilities.

Access Control Points, PN 57477, Questions:

58. It should be noted that the 32 Borings that were provided for the Access Control Points Project only pertain to the specific locations where the Gates are to be constructed. These 32 Borings cannot be used by the bidders to determine the depth to rock for the communications system duct bank trenching. Therefore, additional subsurface information is needed for the Access Control Points Project.

The information provided is the best information available; any additional information is the Contractor's responsibility.

59. When new embankments are to be constructed, such as those shown on Sheet #C54 of the Access Control Points Project, is the contractor expected to use imported soils or on-site excavated soils? This drawing does not indicate what type of soils to use for the new embankments.

See section 02300 in amendment 5.

60. The cross sections shown on Sheet #C54 of the Access Control Points Project do not show a topsoil layer to be created prior to seeding the new embankment. Please clarify whether or not a topsoil layer is required as part of the restoration work.

See section 02300 and 02921 in amendment 5.

61. Note #1 on Sheet #C62 of the Access Control Project discusses the contractor's responsibility for existing utilities even though all utility information may not be shown on the plans. Please verify our interpretation that any additional costs associated with utilities that do not conform to the information on the plans will be considered a changed condition.

All known utilities are indicated on the plans and the best information available. Variance to that information does not necessarily constitute a cost change. The need for a modification would be circumstance dependent and determined during construction.

62. Note #6 on Sheet #C62 of the Access Control Project discusses the contractor's responsibility to save trees and shrubs that are marked to be saved even though this information will not be known to the contractor until the mark-out occurs. Therefore, please verify our interpretation that any additional costs associated with these efforts will be considered a changed condition since the bidders will not know if there will be any additional costs until the trees and shrubs are marked-out after the award of the contract.

Any trees and shrubs to be saved would be marked on the plans. None are identified.

63. Note #11 on Sheet #C62 of the Access Control Project discusses the contractor's responsibility to remove and replace fences that conflict with the proposed improvements at no additional cost. Please verify our interpretation that any additional costs associated with removing and replacing fences not shown on the drawings will be considered a changed condition.

Any items to be removed and replaced as part of the work are shown on the plans. If the Contractor wants additional room or access for his convenience there will be no additional cost to the government.

64. There are several locations on Sheets #C14, #C20 and #C38 of the Access Control Points Project where the contractor is directed to construct 75', 90', 100', and 130' long Bores without the use of casing pipes. Please clarify the following issues regarding these uncased Bores:

a. Please explain why this unusual requirement is being made and why a steel casing pipe is not required like the other Bores on this project?

Casings are only required as shown on the plans. The remaining bores are to avoid pavement removal and replacement.

b. Please provide more information regarding the nature of the soils and ground water in these locations?

The available subsurface information is shown on the plans. The Contractor may obtain additional information at his own cost.

c. Please clarify that the contractor does not bear the risk of a collapse of the uncased Bore?

The Contractor is responsible for all of his work.

d. Are the uncased Bores intended to be constructed using Horizontal Directional Drilling methods?

The construction methods are up to the contractor as long as it meets the plans and specification requirements.

65. A note on Sheet #C41 of the Access Control Points Project directs the contractor to "Remove Asphalt Millings" from an existing parking lot. Please clarify whether or not the parking lot has already been milled by others, or is this contractor expected to perform the pavement milling. If this contractor is expected to perform the milling, please specify how deep the milling is to be performed and provide information on the thickness of the various layers of existing pavement materials.

The parking lot is constructed of old millings as a surface material.

66. Sheet #C46 of the Access Control Points Project directs the contractor to use Sheet #C57 for Concrete Pavement Details. However, Sheet #C46 requires a Dowelled Contraction Joint, and a detail of this type of joint is not shown on Sheet #C57. Please provide this missing information.

This detail will be added as part of amendment 6.

67. Please clarify why the new parking lot for Gate #12 of the Access Control Points Project is to be constructed in the stages shown on Sheet #C47.

The staging is to maintain traffic.

68. Sheet #C46 and #C57 of the Access Control Points Project do not show the locations and details of the construction joints needed for the construction staging shown on Sheet #C47. Please provide the missing information.

AE is unable to determine that information is not adequate.

69. Sheet #S9 of the Access Control Points Project shows embedded anchor bolts as the typical method of anchoring the Canopy Columns to the concrete foundations. Please clarify whether or not the contractor will be permitted to use drilled-in “chemical” anchors, such as those made by Hilti Fasteners, or equal, in lieu of the embedded anchor bolts.

No, the bolts must be embedded.

70. Sheet #E40 of the Access Control Points Project provides typical Grounding Details. With regard to these details, please clarify the following:

a. Please provide notes that explain the intent and the locations where these details are to be used?

This has been clarified by amendment 6.

b. Is the purpose of the column detail to require grounding of all canopy columns or just some of them?

All columns are to be grounded per details on E40.

c. Are the canopy columns grounded to individual ground rods that are tied to a ground-ring?

Yes, per details on E40.

d. If a ground ring is to be provided, then please show a typical plan view of the ground-ring?

Per detail on E40.

e. Please clarify the required diameter and length of the ground rods?

Included in specification section 16415, paragraph 2.8.1.

f. And please clarify where the Typical Trench Detail is to be used, since drawing #E35 also provides typical trench details for new ductbanks.

Detail is to be used where a ductbank is not installed and the ducts are not plowed in.

71. Several of the new Gates for the Access Control Points Project require staged construction due to traffic concerns. However, the bidders do not possess the necessary knowledge of the local traffic conditions to know the extent of the temporary traffic control measures that will be required. Therefore, please provide Typical Traffic Control Plans that show the minimum requirements for signs and other temporary traffic control devices that the contractor will be expected to provide during the staged construction.

Temporary traffic control measures are to comply with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as required by the general notes on the construction sequencing sheets.

72. For the Access Control Points Project, the Civil Drawings are not coordinated with the Electrical Drawings. For example, Civil Drawing #C41 does not identify the symbols used for the existing light poles and provides no indication that any existing light poles are to be removed. Civil Drawing #C45 does not show the dimensioned locations of any new light pole foundations even though the new light pole foundations need to be coordinated with the civil work. Please provide this missing information on the Civil Drawings.

The information is not duplicated between disciplines as it has potential to cause conflicts.

73. Electrical Drawing #E32 does not explain what the removal of a “35/4 Wood Pole and Fixture” entails. Regarding this work, please clarify the following:

a. Is the pole to be entirely removed or just cut-off at ground level?

Pole is to be removed as indicated. The note does not indicate removal of pole to ground level.

b. What is a “35/4” Wood Pole, and can a typical detail be provided for this type of pole?

Description added to E32 by amendment 6.

c. When the existing poles are removed, is the contractor expected to dispose of the poles and fixtures or salvage these items and take them to a designated area on-site for future use by the Fort?

Poles and lighting fixtures are to be disposed of. The notes do not indicate salvaging of either the poles or lighting fixtures.

d. Are there any new utility poles to be furnished and installed by this contractor?

New poles are to be installed per the plans.

74. Electrical Sheet #E37 provides a Lighting Fixture Schedule but does not provide quantities and locations where these lighting fixtures are to be installed. Please provide this missing information.

This information is located throughout the plans where the lighting fixtures are depicted. Quantities and locations are not typically provided in the lighting fixture schedule.

75. Sheet #C68 of the Access Control Points Project indicates that the “DOD Decal VEHICLES ONLY” Sign is to be mounted overhead. All other new permanent signs are to be ground-mounted. Sheet #C75 does not show any details for overhead signs. Please clarify where this overhead sign is to be installed and how it is to be installed.

The overhead sign was removed from project; sign will be pole mounted per amendment 6.

76. Sheet #C74 of the Access Control Points Project show two permanent signs that are blacked out. Please clarify what is to be done with these two signs.

This has been fixed in amendment 6.

77. Sheet #C75 of the Access Control Points Project shows details for installing permanent signs, one of which is a wood post with footing. Please clarify where this detail is to be used. For example, when viewing a typical Sign Plan Drawing, such as #C6, the notes only refer to the use of wood posts or metal posts, without any mention of a footing.

For example, see sheet C73, note under DOD Decal Vehicles sign.

78. The Solicitation Contract Form (Bid Proposal) contains Base Bid Items and Add-on Alternate/Optional Items. Page #6 of 77 provides brief descriptions of the scopes-of-work to be included in the various Optional Items. However, some of these descriptions are ambiguous and we request clarification regarding the following optional scopes of work:

a. Optional Items #0005, #0006, and #0007: None of the Civil Drawings or Plumbing Drawings for these three Gates call-out the Civil and Plumbing Work as being Optional Work. However, the Electrical Drawings for these Gates do contain notes stating that the Electrical Work on those drawings is Optional Work. Therefore, if all of the Civil and Plumbing Work for these Gates is Optional Work, then the Civil and Plumbing Drawings need to be revised to include notes that are consistent with the notes on the Electrical Drawings, in order to correct any possible misunderstanding that the only optional work is the Electrical Work associated with these three Gates.

The description for the options states that ALL work associated with the various optional gates is included. Not every sheet or discipline will be marked as electrical was.

b. Optional Item #0008-Visitor Center Canopy (Gate #1): the only drawing that was cited in the description on page #6 is Sheet #C4, which does not provide a complete view of the entire canopy. Please confirm that this Option also includes all of the work shown on Sheets #A13 and #S3, including all associated electrical work and the canopy column foundations.

It does.

c. Optional Item #0009- Trooper Drive Inspection Canopy (Gate #3): the only drawing that was cited in the description on page #6 is Sheet #C17, which does not provide a complete view of the entire canopy. Please confirm that this Option also includes all of the work shown on Sheets #A17 and #S6, including all associated electrical work and the canopy column foundations.

It does.

d. Optional Item #0010- Huebner Drive Inspection Canopy (Gate #11): the only drawing that was cited in the description on page #6 is Sheet #C35, which does not provide a complete view of the entire canopy. Please confirm that this Option also includes all of the work shown on Sheets #A17 and #S6, including all associated electrical work and the column foundations.

It does.

79. For the Access Control Project there are notes on Sheets #C53, #C54, and #C55 which require the contractor to "tie the new embankment fill into existing road embankment to prevent differential movement". However, the method of performing this work is not shown or explained on the drawings. It is our experience that differential settlement can be controlled but not prevented. A common method is to place the new embankment fill in controlled lifts and key the new embankment layers into the existing embankment in a stepped fashion. Please clarify if

this is the type of procedure intended by the notes on these drawings to control the amount of differential settlement.

Yes, this is the intended procedure.

80. For the Access Control Project, Sheet #C48, #C49, and #C50 show Optional Guard Booths for the Guard Booths at Henry Drive, Trooper Drive and Huebner Drive. However, the bid documents do not provide any direction as to how these Optional Guard Booths are to be treated in the bid proposals. Therefore, please clarify what is intended by these Optional Guard Booths.

The guard booths labeled optional on the plans will be installed after completion of this contract by the government, if needed, and are not included in this solicitation.

81. For the Access Control Project, Sheets #A1 to #A17 are not dimensioned correctly, and they misrepresent the sizes of these structures. It appears that the CAD drawing was not calibrated to the proper scale. Please re-issue all of the affected drawings with the correct dimensions, and check other drawings to ensure that this problem is not occurring on other drawings.

This is part of amendment 6.

82. With regard to the Duress Signal System included in Section #13798 of the Technical Specifications, please clarify where this system is to be installed, since it is not called-out on any of the drawings for the Gate Houses and Guard Booths.

There is no duress signal system on the plans. This section will be deleted by amendment.

83. With regard to the Emergency Generator Sets specified in Section #16264 of the Technical Specifications, please clarify whether or not all Emergency Generator Sets are to be furnished with a weatherproof enclosure. Also, please note that the notes on the drawings do not always call-out weatherproof enclosures for the generators at all of the locations.

Notes will be modified on Sheets E6, E12, E18, E29, and E33 to include weatherproof enclosures for all generators by amendment 6.

84. Please provide typical plans, elevations, and details for the above mentioned weatherproof enclosures and suggested manufacturers.

The weatherproof enclosures do not have any specific requirements other than those specified in Section 16264 for intake air, filtering and exhaust. It is the Contractor's responsibility to obtain qualified suppliers.

85. The above mentioned specifications for Emergency Generator Sets do not provide suggested manufacturers and model numbers to guide the bidders on pricing this equipment. Please provide this missing information.

This Information is not typically provided in government solicitations and will not be added.

86. The above mentioned specifications for Emergency Generator Sets do not provide minimum sizes for the fuel tanks, and do not specify whether or not the fuel tanks are single-walled or double-walled construction. Please provide this missing information.

The requirement for the fuel tanks to be single-wall will be added by amendment to section 16264, paragraph 2.3.4. The minimum size of the tanks is addressed in paragraph 2.3.4.1.

87. Regarding the Cathodic Protection Systems included in Section #13110A of the Technical Specifications, please clarify the following:

a. Is Cathodic Protection to be provided only for the Steel Casing Pipes used as the Sleeves for the Bores?

Yes, as shown on sheet E39.

b. Are the steel casing pipes to be bare or coated?

Sheet E39 was amended to indicate coated steel pipe in the Roadway Boring detail.

c. For bidding purposes, are the bidders to include only the costs of furnishing and installing the typical system shown on the Roadway Boring Details included on Sheet #E39 for the Access Control Points and on Sheet #E23 for the Security Fencing Project?

Yes.

d. If the design and construction of the aforementioned typical cathodic protection system requires more expensive modifications to suit actual soil conditions, will the contractor be compensated for the difference in cost?

The need for a modification would have to be addressed during construction and would be determined based on the circumstances.

88. With regard to the exterior Signs listed on specification page #10430A-5 the bid documents do not provide any details or elevations of these signs. Please clarify the size of these signs, the location and method of mounting these signs, and the type and thickness of the material to be used for the sign panels.

Section 10430 in amendment 5 covers most of this information.

89. On Drawing #E35, of the Access Control Points Plans, which shows typical duct bank configurations, please clarify the following items:

a. Is the Subduct made from a one-piece, multi-duct type of conduit, or several conduits bundled together?

Note added to detail on E35 indicating bundled conduits by amendment 6.

b. Please provide suggested manufacturers and specifications for the Subduct?

One manufacturer is Carlon.

c. What is the definition of "EB" in the "EB PVC" designation?

"EB" is a standard designation for "Encased Burial." This has been added to the list of abbreviations on G4 by amendment 6.

90. The Typical Detail on Sheet #40 of the Access Control Points Plans shows a 4" diameter conduit at the bottom of the trench. Is this the typical trench detail to be used for all power conduits even though the power layout plans indicate power conduits less than 4" diameter?

Detail on E40 has been modified to indicate that conduit size is to be as indicated on the plans by amendment 6.

91. The notes under the typical Trench Detail, on Sheet #E40 of the Access Control Points Plans, allow the use of both Rigid Metallic Conduit and Rigid, Schedule 40 PVC Conduit. Is the choice of conduit materials the contractor's option; or, are there locations where only Rigid Metallic Conduit is to be used, and are there locations where Rigid, Schedule 40 PVC conduit is to be used? Please clarify.

The use of rigid metal or rigid non-metallic is the contractor's option. The note has been modified to indicate this choice by amendment 6.

92. Notes on Sheets #C8 and #C9, of the Access Control Points Plans, points to a "Temporary Visitor Check [point] during Construction of Intersection at Marshall Drive". Please clarify if this contractor is to construct or remove this Temporary Visitor Checkpoint.

The note about temporary inspection area is for information only for the contractor. The existing visitor inspection and permit area is east of Henry on Marshal Drive. During the construction of the Marshal Drive intersection, Marshal Drive may need to be closed. If access cannot be maintained to the existing visitor inspection area, the fort will set up a temporary inspection area at the existing Kiosk. The fort wants the temporary as short as possible. The contractor is to maintain access to either the existing visitor inspection or the temporary area at all times. Notes have been added by amendment 6.

93. Sheet #E21 for Access Control Gate #4 – Rifle Range Road, and #E23 for Access Control Gate 5 – Estes Road both show Parking Lots and Gate Houses adjacent to these two Gates. Please clarify whether or not the contractor is to perform any work related to the Parking Lots and Gate Houses shown adjacent to these two Gates.

Sheets E21 and E23 have been modified to indicate the correct existing site layout by amendment 6.

94. In our discussions with fabricators who specialize in the construction of Canopies it was pointed out to us that the members of their industry are typically not certified by AISC for Category I Structural Steelwork (see Paragraph #3.1 on page #05120A-5 of the Structural Steel Section); and, that this type of certification is typically obtained by shops that fabricate structural steel for buildings. Therefore, we wish to clarify whether or not the AISC certification may be waived, provided the fabrication of the canopy structural steel meets the specified fabrication and performance criteria.

The AISC Category 1 is the least restrictive industry certification, which basically says they have a quality control plan and follow it, and they understand how to meet AWS welding standards. This is not an unreasonable standard to meet and will not be waived.

95. For the Access Control Points project, the removals drawing C22 for gate 4 and C27 for gate 5 do not indicate any existing pavement to be removed for the proposed road widening. Since this is inconsistent with the details for the other gates on this project, please confirm if

there is to be any existing pavement removed for gate 4 and gate 5 in order to construct the proposed road widening at these two locations. If existing pavement is to be removed at these two locations, we request that drawings C22 and C27 be revised to clearly show the removal limits related to the road widening.

No pavement removal for the road widening is required.

96. Sheets C64, C65 and C66 show the reinforced concrete impact attenuator backstops as being 30" thick. However, sheets C48, C\$9 and C50 show the backstops as 24" and 30" thick. Please clarify the correct thickness.

All backstops were corrected to 30" as part of amendment 6.

Cantonment Fencing, PN 57482, Questions:

97. Drawing C45 does not indicate the following items for line posts in cable barriers: pipe diameter, depth of bury, maximum spacing and concrete foundations.

This will be corrected in amendment 6. Pipe diameter is 4 inches. Depth of bury is 36 inches minimum. Maximum spacing on fence line post is 10 feet. Concrete foundations are not required on the cable barrier line posts.

98. Has a new bid schedule been substituted for the original? If not, I have a problem concerning where to include the electrical work on project #57482. Sheets E-1 through E-10 instructions say they are to be a bid option. Which options do they go under? Do the remainder of the sheets go under Base bid item 0011? Please advise.

The bid schedule will be corrected by amendment 6.

99. For the Security Fencing Project #G1 and #C1 show maps of the work areas, but these maps do not provide sufficient information to allow the bidders to understand the distance and geographical relationship between the main work area and the Multipurpose Range Complex and Route 77 work areas. Therefore, please provide a smaller scale map that shows the actual geographical relationship between these work areas.

Note will be added to sheet C1 by amendment 6. "South end of US 77 fence work is approximately 5 miles north and 4 miles west of Vinton Road Access Point."

100. For the Security Fencing Project, Sheet #C3 shows a typical road cross section with new embankment being created adjacent to new cable barrier. With regard to this detail, please clarify the following.

a. Provide exact stationing and other site location information to allow the bidders to identify exactly which portions of the new cable barrier is affected by this detail.

The detail is for general information relating to positioning of cable barrier.

b. Provide accurate cross-sections, drawn-to-scale, every 50 feet on center through these new embankment areas so that the bidders can accurately estimate the embankment quantities.

Cross sections shall be included in the plans by amendment 6.

c. Will the new embankments require the placement of topsoil layer prior to seeding?

See Section 02300 and 02921 issued by amendment 5.

d. Is the embankment to be constructed with imported soil or soils obtained from excess excavations or on-site borrow pits?

See Section 02300 issued by amendment 5.

101. Please clarify whether or not the embankment work for the cable barrier on sheet #C3 shall be included with the optional fence work or the base bid.

All work described on this sheet and notes to the bid schedule on page 5 of 77 is part of the option.

102. On page #6 of 77 of the solicitation, the description of work for the base bid security fencing includes "Storm Drainage". Please clarify what storm drainage work is intended and where the bidders are to find this work on the drawings.

The words storm drainage for the fencing is only intended for erosion control.

103. For the fence option #1 pricing, please clarify whether or not the deleted Tank Trail Purple fencing includes only the fence work that is shown on sheet #C2, and all of the fence work shown on sheet #C2.

See note for bid schedule page 6 of 77 that states less the work shown on sheet C2 titled Tank Trail Purple fence that deletes Tank Trail Purple fencing east of Trooper Drive.

104. For the security fencing project, please clarify the length of the cable barrier that is to be constructed at Station 39+34 on sheet #C2.

Corrected by amendment 6. Cable starts at station 39+34 and ends at station 39+87 end of Tank Trail Purple cantonment fence.

105. For the security fencing project, sheet #C10 shows a rock barrier to be constructed. Is the rock barrier to be constructed solely with the rocks that are to be removed from the existing rock barrier shown on sheet #C9.

Yes and at other locations that show a rock barrier.

106. For the security fencing project, certain site plan drawings show some dashed contour lines intermixed with solid contour lines, such as the ones on sheet #C10 between station 20+00 and station 25+00. Please clarify what these dashed contour lines are supposed to represent.

The dashed lines are from field surveys used in profile generation and typically not shown. There is no significant impact of these lines showing on the plans but the drawing is clarified by amended by amendment 6 to represent the dashed contour lines as not being part of the work on this sheet.

107. Every one of the site plan drawings for the security fencing project contains a note that states, "Install Brace Panels as specified". Please clarify the following:

a. Does this note refer to the Brace Panel detail in the lower left hand corner of sheet #C42 which requires Brace Panels to be installed whenever straight runs exceed 500 feet.

Yes note refers to the Brace Panel detail in the lower left hand corner of the sheet.

b. Please define "straight runs", for instance, does the term "straight" only refer to the horizontal (plan view) alignment of the fence?

Yes, straight refers to the horizontal alignment of the fence.

108. For the security fencing project, sheet #C33 shows several signs that appear to be part of the fencing scope of work. However, there are no sign details included with the fencing drawings and the signs are not included in the scope of work for the base bid fence work on page #6 of the solicitation. Therefore, please clarify whether or not these signs are to be included in the base bid; and, if so, then please provide the missing sign details and specifications.

The signs are part of the base bid and manufactured and installed according to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD); they will be addressed by amendment 6.

109. For the security fencing project, sheets #38, 39, 40 and 41 contain the same note that directs the contractor to install the new fence 10 feet inside of the existing fence line. However, the small scale of the drawings does not show this existing fence line. Please clarify.

a. Is the existing fence line to remain?

Yes. Existing fence is to remain and drawing line work showing new work and existing work is more legible on the drawings to be issued by amendment 6.

b. Does the existing fence have gates through which access can be obtained to the new fence line.

Yes. The entire length of the fence is accessible from the government side.

c. If there are no gates for the contractor to use, please explain how the contractor is to gain access to the new fence line with personnel, materials and equipment.

Gates do exist in the existing fence.

110. For the security fencing project please clarify where on the site plan drawing Note #8 will apply.

See General notes on sheet G3. All areas disturbed by construction work.

111. When performing the clearing work for the new Security Fence Project will the 50' wide Clear Zone apply only to trees and vegetation at the ground level, or will those limits extend up from the ground to include any overhanging branches that fall within the vertical limits of the 50' wide Clear Zone "air space". Please clarify the extent of this clearing work.

The intent is to allow full observation of the entire chain link fence.

112. Please clarify why only selected portions of the Security Fencing Project included Rock Classification Information on the Site Plan drawings.

These are the only sections indicating rock from the referenced source.

113. Please clarify how the Rock Depth Charts and Soils Classifications were developed. If a subsurface exploration program (Borings) was used to develop this information, please include that information in the addendum.

The depth to rock information is based on USDA, SCS "Soil Survey of Riley & Geary Counties".

114. The Bid Documents do not provide any information regarding the Rock (rock type, rock quality, hardness, etc.) that is to be found at the depths shown on the Rock Charts mentioned above. Please provide this missing information as quickly as possible since it is essential for developing site-specific costs for performing the excavating and trenching work.

The depth to rock information is based on USDA, SCS "Soil Survey of Riley & Geary Counties". The information provided is the best information available; any additional information is the Contractor's responsibility.

115. For both projects, the drawings do not provide details of fence posts, cable-barrier posts, sign posts, etc. which may be impacted by the presence of rock. All of the post details are based on soil conditions. If rock is expected to be encountered when installing these posts then rock-related details need to be added to the details on the drawings.

See sections 02300 and 02821 in amendment 5.

116. Sheet #C57 of the Security Fencing Project provides a Typical Section of the Inspection Road, which implies that the road will be excavated 6" deep, filled with the specified stone, and the top of the road will be graded to blend in with the existing topography without the need for any additional cutting, filling, and grading. This interpretation is also supported by Sheets # 47 to #C56, which show the Inspection Road alignment without any changes in the existing topographic lines. Please confirm that this interpretation is correct.

That's the correct interpretation.

117. With regard to the construction of the Inspection Road, the notes on Sheet #57 require the bottom 4" of rock to be blended with the underlying soils, and then topped off with 2" of rock to create a 6" thick road. As an alternate to this method, will the contractor be permitted to use a well-graded, quarry-blended aggregate base course for the full 6" depth of the road?

Bid per specifications. We cannot pre-approve contractor alternates prior to award of the contract.

118. Sheet #G1 of the Security Fencing Project shows a map that points out a C&D Landfill and a Brush Habitat Area. Sheet #G1 of the Access Control Points Project shows the same facilities and includes a Borrow Area. Please explain the significance of these areas, and if these areas are to be used by the contractors working on these two projects.

Use of these areas are covered in the specifications. Construction debris and excess material go to the CD landfill. Borrow comes from C/D landfill area as specified. Plans clarified by amendment 6.

119. Sheet #G3 of the Security Fencing Project contains several notes that need to be clarified: The 7th Note describes placing "Disposed Material" in an appropriate facility within the Fort. With regard to this requirement, please clarify the following: (1) clarify where the disposal facility is located on the Site Plans; (2) identify the types of materials that are expected to be placed in the disposal facility; (3) are the disposed materials to be dumped in the facility without any segregation and sorting by the contractor; and, (4) will the contractor be required to operate and manage the disposal facility in any way?

Amendment 5 clarifies the segregation of material requirements. The disposal sites are shown on G1.

120. For the Security Fence Project, the drawings do not provide any grounding details. Therefore, we assume that none of the new fence will be grounded. Please verify this interpretation.

Fence grounding is detailed on E25, Fence Grounding Detail.

121. Several locations call for either 16 ft. or 30 ft. Manual Gates and refer to Detail Sheet C43. Sheet C43 shows a Double Swing Gate and a DBL-DBL Gate. The specifications refer to the structure of gate panels over or under 8 ft., but neither designate which of the gate details are to be placed at the 16 ft. and 30 ft. gate locations. Can single swing gates be used for the 16 ft. gate openings, or do they need to be double swing gates (2-8 ft. panels)? Also, Can two 15' gate panels be used for the 30 ft. gate openings, or is a DBL-DBL Gate required in these locations?

A note will be added to sheet C43 as part of amendment 6: "NOTE: Single Swing Gates Shall Not Exceed 14 Feet and Double Swing Gates Shall Not Exceed 28 Feet."

122. Note 2 on the drawing from Bucher, Willis & Ratliff specifies the cable barrier material as follows:

"Cable Barrier shall be U.S. Domestic 3/4 inch 6x19 Class Wire Rope, Regular Lay, Extra Improved Plow Steel (EIPS) independent Wire Rope Core (IWRC), Class A Galvanized, in accordance with ASTM A475"

We are being told by the supplier of the wire rope that this wording has conflicting statements. A475 is a specification for the strands only, and it does not have a grade for EIPS.

We would like you to verify that the reference to A475 is only with regards to the galvanizing of the strands and not the material of the strands. Please advise.

The material specified is correct. The reference to ASTM A475 is for the galvanizing only.

123. Do you really want 5000 psi concrete for the mow strip?

The requirement for 5000 psi concrete will be changed to 4000 psi for the mow strip.

124. On sheet E11 the prints show making splice to existing Fiber in the fiber hut.

a. On the following Sheets E-12,E-13,E-14 they show on pulling fiber thru the fiber hut is this correct?

Yes.

b. On sheet E-15 the fiber is shown just to end at the new hut. Is there are splicing to be done in this fiber hut? If any splicing is to be done in the new fiber huts then details will need to issued on what is expected.

No splicing is to be done in the hut.

125. On sheet C44 the GATE TIE - OFF DETAIL. Where is this used on the fence?

The detail has been clarified on C44 by amendment 6.

126. On the cable barrier:

a. Do the posts have any caps on them? The details do not show any.

No post caps.

b. Are there any tie-offs at the pulls?

No.

127. On chain link fence are radius's allowed or will all curves horizontal and vertical be made with corners and straight runs. If radius are allowed what is acceptable?

Corners are to be made with corners and straight runs.

128. On sheet C4, 2 each 50' sections of guard fence is shown. There are no specifications or drawings. Are we to assume that it is to be built by KDOT requirements?

The guard fence end terminals are to meet KDOT requirements. See notes on Sheet C4.

129. On sheet C42 & C43 the details are different for the diameter and depth of the post holes. Which is correct?

The variances in post hole requirements will be clarified by amendment 6.

130. When viewing the site conditions along Old Tank Trail Purple during the Site Visit on 12-19-02, it appears that the new fence line may be located on the sloped embankment of that road. Since the detail on Sheet #C57 shows the Mow Strip to be constructed on ground that is perpendicular to the fence post, we wish to clarify that, in "cross-slope" situations such as this, that the Mow Strip will conform to the cross-slopes. Please clarify.

The intent is for the mow strip to conform to the cross-slopes. Added note to C57 by amendment 6.

131. On Sheet #C45 of the Security Fencing Project Plans, there are details showing concrete footings for the Cable Barrier Deadmen. However, the plans do not provide a typical detail for a Cable Barrier Line Post. At the present time, we assume that the Cable Barrier Line Posts are "driven", and are not encased in concrete. Please clarify this detail.

This assumption is correct. Note added to C45 by amendment 6.

132. For the Security Fence Project, please confirm that the new Fence Inspection Road is to be constructed only where shown on plan Sheets #C47 to #C56.

The road is to be constructed only where shown on the plans.

133. There is a typical detail for Existing Aggregate Road Improvements shown on the bottom of Sheet #C57 of the Security Fence Project. Please clarify what is intended by this typical detail and where this work shall be performed.

Note added to C33 by amendment 6.

134. Please clarify the following items concerning the Clearing and Grubbing work that is to be performed for the Security Fencing Project:

a. Paragraph #1.30 on page #01100-9 of the General Conditions describes a labor intensive Timber Disposal Program involving the separation and disposal of tree parts according to size and type of tree. However, these requirements are not found in the General Construction Notes on Sheet #G3 of the Security Fencing Plan, and Paragraph #3.4.1 on page #02230a-2 of the Clearing and Grubbing Specification Section. Please clarify which requirements shall apply to this project.

This was revised as part of amendment 5.

b. Considering the logistical problems associated with the tree clearing work along the entire length of the new fence line, will the contractor be permitted to use a tree chipper as one of the approved methods for the disposal of the tree parts?

The intent is for removed trees to be piled along the work site for wildlife habitat.

c. Please clarify the minimum width of the clearing limits for the new 12'-0" wide crushed stone Inspection Road shown on plan Sheets #C47 to #C56.

The inspection road is to be constructed within the 30-foot clear zone extended. Note added to C46 by amendment 6.

135. Sheet #C37 of the Security Fencing Plans includes a note that states that Fence #2 is to begin at Station 10+00. However, this does not appear to be the correct Station. Please clarify.

This has been clarified by amendment 6.

136. Sheets C2 thru C37 indicate the exact location and depth of rock. Sheets C38 thru C41 (Highway 77 Fence) indicates nothing in terms of rock. May we assume that there will be no rock in this area? If no, how do we quantify the rock.

No additional information is available for the fence project. The note "Rock Depth Chart Data from USDA, SCS Soil Survey of Riley and Geary Counties is added to the Rock Depth Chart in amendment 6. You should also review paragraph 3.3 Post Installation added by amendment 5.